

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are in the subject application, as filed. Claims 1, 2, 5-14 and 16-21 were rejected. Claims 3-4 and 15 were objected to. In paragraph 1, the Examiner has suggested that Claims 2 and 13 be corrected to indicate degree marks. Degree marks have been added to Claims 2 and 13. Claims 3, 14 and 15 have been cancelled.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as the Examiner indicated that tetraethylorthosilicate (as recited in Claim 7) is not consistent with formula(I) set forth in Claim 1. Applicant has reviewed Claims 1 and 7 and believes that tetraethylorthosilicate is consistent with formula (I). The structure of tetraethylorthosilicate, as shown in a well-known catalog of chemicals, is $\text{Si}(\text{OC}_2\text{H}_5)_4$. This structure is consistent with formula (I) of Claim 1 where $\text{R1} = \text{R2} = \text{R3} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_5$ and $\text{Rd} = \text{OC}_2\text{H}_5$ (which is an organic non-polymerizable moiety and hence satisfies the Claim 1 limitation). In view of the above discussion, Applicant respectfully requests removal of this rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 102 and 103

Claims 1-2, 5-13, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Holmes-Farley (US 5, 139, 601). The Examiner argues that Holmes-Farley discloses a primer coating the forms covalent bonds with the surface of the substrate.

Claim 14 was also rejected under Holmes-Farley as evidenced by Coleman (US 3,258,388). The examiner asserts that Holmes-Farley teaches that the bonding adhesive can be a composition comprising a di-C-nitroso aromatic compound and a metal adherent and a vulcanizable olefin. This rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of Claim 14.

Claim 17 was rejected as anticipated over JP045 (JP 2000-272045). As indicated in the Office action, this reference discloses a layered structure comprising a steel substrate. There is no teaching of a silicon wafer substrate in this reference, which limitation is now present in amended Claim 17. Thus, applicant argues that amended Claim 17 is not anticipated by JP045.

Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated or obvious under 35 USC 103 over Holmes-Farley. Claims 18 and 19 are dependent upon Claim 17, which, as amended herein, now includes a limitation of a silicon wafer substrate to distinguish over Holmes-Farley.

Claims 18-21 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated or obvious under 35 USC 103 over JP045. Claims 18-21 are either directly or indirectly dependent from amended

Claim 17, which as shown above, is not obvious or anticipated by this reference. Hence these dependent claims are also not obvious nor anticipated by this reference.

Claims 1-2, 5, 8-9, 10-11 were rejected as anticipated over JP045 (JP 2000-272045) as evidenced by Blohowiak (US 5,939,197). However, neither of these references discloses a silicon wafer substrate, which is a limitation in the now amended claims (both independent and dependent claims) and hence these amended claims are no longer anticipated by these references.

Claims 12-14 and 16, which are process claims, were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated or under 35 USC 103 as obvious over JP045, as evidenced by Blohowiak. Amended Claim 12, and the dependent claims which depend from it, now has limitations of the energy curable composition comprising a free radical-polymerizable monomer or oligomer and a photoinitiator and that the energy curable composition is polymerized by exposure to actinic radiation. Neither of these two applied references disclose these limitations and hence the amended claims are not anticipated or obvious.

Applicant does not admit that the claims are either anticipated or obvious over the cited art. However, to advance the prosecution of this case, applicants have elected to amend the claims as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner indicates that Claim 3, 4 and 15 would be allowable if not dependent upon a rejected claim. Applicant has placed the limitations of Claim 3 into amended Claim 1 and has cancelled Claim 3. Claim 4 now depends up amended Claim 1. Applicant has also amended the other claims to make the substrate a silicon wafer. Applicant has furthermore placed the limitations of Claims 14 and 15 into amended Claim 12 and has cancelled Claims 14 and 15. Claim 16 now depends upon amended Claim 12.

Furthermore, as the Examiner has correctly indicated in the Office action, the following reason that Claims 3, 4 and 15 would be allowable (if not dependent upon a rejected claim): "Holmes-Farley does not teach or fairly suggest a) a silicon wafer substrate; and b) a photoinitiator and an energy curable composition being polymerized by exposure to actinic radiation."

For the reasons indicated above, Applicant believes that amended Claim 1 is now patentable over Holmes-Farley and hence any dependent claims dependent upon amended Claim 1 (Claims 2, 4-11) are also patentable.

Also for the reasons advanced above, Applicant believes that amended Claims 12 and 17 are now patentable over Holmes-Farley and hence any dependent claims dependent upon amended Claim 12 and Claim 17 are also patentable.

It is respectfully requested that Claim 1,2, 4-13, 16-21 be allowed.

If anything further is needed to advance the allowance of this case, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' attorney at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,



BARBARA C. SIEGELL
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 30,684
Telephone: 302-992-4931
Facsimile: 302-892-7949

Dated: August 5, 2003